

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the Restriction Requirement mailed May 12, 2008. The Applicant elects with traverse Species I that include claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-12, 25-31, 33, 38 and 43-44. Claims 4-5, 8-10, 13-24 and 39-42 have been withdrawn. Claims 32 and 34-37 have been previously canceled.

The Applicant does not traverse the restriction of Species X, XI, and XII.

The Applicant traverses the division of the various manners of coupling the first and second stroller portions. Species I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX are each embodiments of coupling the first and second stroller portions. The application in general is directed to first and second stroller portions that are coupled together, and should not be limited to the specific manners of coupling.

The Applicant also traverses the designation of species XIII identified as a single stroller and a double stroller, and species XIV identified as two double strollers. Figures 10A and 10B are included in the application as different embodiments and should not be limiting to the overall concept of the application.

The Applicant further traverses the Restriction Requirement because overall it provides no specific reasons for why the division into 14 different species is necessary. Page 3 of the Restriction Requirement generically indicates that these species have mutually exclusive characteristics and are not obvious variants of each other. However, the Restriction Requirement does not indicate which characteristics are mutually exclusive and why the species are not obvious variants of each other. Page 3 also indicates that there is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species because the species require a different field of search, and/or prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to other species, and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues. However, the Restriction Requirement does not provide any specific indication other than these general statements. There is no indication of the fields of search or queries that would be required, no

indication of why prior art applicable to one species would not be applicable to another, or what different non-prior art issues may arise between the species.

A Restriction Requirement requires an Examiner to state the reasons relied upon for holding the inventions as being distinct. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. (MPEP, § 808.01). In this instance, the Restriction Requirement has only made conclusory statements and has given no actual reasons that would sustain the necessity for the restriction.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant submits the present application is in condition for examination, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Kalish', written over a horizontal line.

David D. Kalish
Registration No.: 42,706

Dated: June 12, 2008

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084